



An Application of the Kipling Method to DNA Validation in the 21st Century

From Validation to SOP

Charlotte J Word, Ph.D.

Outline

- Development of Technical SOPs
- Development of Interpretation SOPs
- Implementation of New SOPs

Charlotte J Word - 2015

From Validation → Generation of New SOP

- Procedural or Technical SOPs –
 - what to do procedurally (how much to use, what reagents to use, buttons to push, what temperature, etc.)
- Interpretation SOPs –
 - What to do with the data generated
 - How analyze
 - How to make comparisons
 - How to generate statistical estimates
 - How report accurately
 - This has become much more complicated!

Charlotte J Word - 2015

From Validation → Generation of New SOP

MOST CRITICAL ASPECT to focus on:

- What are the limitations of the system?
- Where are there failures?
- What can be done to improve or correct?
- What is the actual capacity & capability of the system being validated?

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Technical SOPs

- Generally this is the easiest part since the procedural steps are often provided by the developer or supplier
 - Often can “cut and paste” into the technical or procedural SOP
 - But must evaluate the validation data to make adjustments
- Did the kits, instruments, etc. perform as expected from developmental validation studies using the technical procedures provided by the developer or supplier?

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Technical SOPs

- Critical to evaluate all parameters tested during the validation
 - What are the ranges of the assay where “good” data are generated?
 - What are the “edges” of the system?
 - Is more testing needed to define “the edges?”
 - What are the limitations of the assay?
- May have to modify the provided procedures
- Important to define the testing parameters ranges that MUST be followed

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Interpretation SOPs

- This is an area needing MUCH attention at this time
- Important to recognize that interpretation guidelines and SOPs MUST come from the data generated in the validation studies
 - Some guidance from published data and recommendations (e.g., ISFG, SWGDAM)

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Interpretation SOPs

- Do the validation study samples tested reflect all of the types of samples accepted and tested in the laboratory?
- Do the interpretation SOPs cover all types of samples accepted and tested in the laboratory?
- Can't make interpretation procedures regarding low template samples or complex mixtures without having validation data to evaluate
 - and needed for training!

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Interpretation SOPs

- Important to determine:
 - What are the limitations of the assay?
 - Under what conditions...
 - Are correct full results obtained?
 - Are the data reproducible in your laboratory and by another lab?
 - Can the results lead to possible misinterpretations due to partial profiles or additional data?
 - Where and what cautions are needed
 - When do the results become uninterpretable or inconclusive?

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Validation of the Interpretation SOPs

It is important to demonstrate that the interpretation SOPs:

- Generate correct and accurate conclusions
- Are detailed enough to provide consistency within the laboratory
 - Do all analysts report the same alleles and genotypes from the same data?
 - How are decisions made regarding artifacts? Thresholds? What flexibility exists?
 - Do all analysts get the same conclusions from the same data?

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Validation of Interpretation SOPs

- If inconsistency within the laboratory:
 - SOPs not detailed or clear enough
 - SOPs do not cover all needed parameters or scenarios adequately
 - Have possibly identified types of samples that should not be interpreted in your laboratory

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Validation of the Interpretation SOPs

Should be evaluated using **known** samples and profiles so expected results are available for analysis and comparison

- With known contributors (know genotypes for all contributors)
 - Have all of the data? missing data?
 - Have "extra" data? (artifacts being called; drop in)
- With known ratios of contributors
- Which are different from the samples used in the validation studies to generate the interpretation SOPs

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Sources of Known Samples and Profiles for Evaluation

- Samples generated in the lab
- Proficiency test samples
- NIST SRMs, NIST mixtures (MIX 05, MIX 13)
- Samples from other laboratory's validations
- Boston University profiles (<http://www.bu.edu/dnamixtures>)
- NOT CASEWORK SAMPLES
 - With possible exception of 2 person mixtures in non-sperm/epithelial fraction of sexual assault samples where non-sperm donor profile is known and sperm fraction profile is single source

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Implementation of New SOPs

- New QA/QC measures
 - Incorporate into proficiency test cycle
 - Critical reagents or instruments
 - Periodic monitoring/assessment
- Training of Analysts
 - May be short or long depending on what is being introduced
 - Competency test
- Assessment for QAS and accreditation at next external audit/inspection

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Implementation of New SOPs

- Additional training/notification of availability
 - Law enforcement
 - Attorneys – prosecution and defense
 - Judges
- Discovery
 - New SOPs (some laboratories post on internet)
 - Validation studies supporting the new SOPs
 - Summaries, tables/graphs of results, actual data
 - List of publications supporting the new assay
 - Training files

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Implementation of New SOPs

- Consider if changes are needed to case acceptance policies
 - Are these new procedures suited to all types of samples currently accepted?
 - Need to decrease acceptance of any types?
 - Can you expand the types of samples accepted?
- Consider impact on previous cases
 - Can additional studies now be done?
 - Do the new studies invalidate anything done previously?

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Implementation of New System

- Plan and prepare for possible admissibility hearing
 - Publications
 - SOPs
 - Validation studies
- May need guidance from experienced attorneys and scientists
 - Very different from routine trial testimony

Charlotte J Word - 2015

Thank You!

- ASCLD
- Mike Coble
- Robin Cotton
- Contact information: cjword@comcast.net
- 301-527-1350
- P.O. Box 5207; Gaithersburg, MD 20882



Charlotte J Word - 2015
